



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/644,121	08/23/2000	Jeffrey A. Hubbell	314573-103C	1371
25561	7590	03/13/2003		
ALLEN BLOOM C/O DECHERT PRINCETON PIKE CORPORATION CENTER P.O. BOX 5218 PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5218			EXAMINER LIPMAN, BERNARD	
			ART UNIT 1713	PAPER NUMBER 16
DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S/N

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/644,121	HUBBELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Bernard Lipman	1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Art Unit 1713

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, as understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Roth et al., U.S. Patent 5,994,475 or Kawai et al., U.S. Patent 5,302,312 or Williams et al., British Patent Application 2,215,335.

All three references teach the microgels as required by applicants' claims made from acrylic acid monomers and containing the potential "anionic" entities as well as the cross-linking as required by applicants' claims. The references are silent as to

Art Unit 1713

the specific properties of the microgels required in applicants' claims but, would be presumed to have these properties absent evidence to the contrary, In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594. It is reasonable to presume that the microgels made of the same monomers and cross-linking entities would possess the same characteristics absent evidence to the contrary. Under In re Fitzgerald practice it is now applicants' responsibility and burden to provide evidence that overcomes this presumption. This is true for the claims as understood.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims are indefinite in the use of the terminology in the claims "non-addition polyanionic polymer" insofar as the polymers are made from ethylenically unsaturated monomers and polymerized using free radical polymerization as seen in the Examples. It is unclear, therefore, how these polymers can be "non-addition polymers". It is further unclear as to what aspect of the polymers the requirement for "non-addition" defines. The requirement for "a hydrolytically susceptible bond" is defined in

Serial No. 09/644,121

-4-

Art Unit 1713

the specification, and many other terms are defined, but the term "non-addition" is not defined. The claims are, therefore, indefinite as to scope and properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.



Bernard Lipman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1713

BL:cdc
March 10, 2003